Dear Alma,

8/2/91

With no outgoing mail until Monday I'll probably be adding to this before I mail it but I do not want to forget to tell you that Lil's second visit to the physical therapist was followed by a remarkable improvement. She hasn't used the walker or the wheelchair since she left his office. At home she hasn't used the cane much, mostly not at all.

I do not intend to give him all the credit for it. It also involves her own determination and perseverance despite pain.

He began with a full explanation I won't try to duplicate but it boils down to the only way to feed and heal joint tissue is to use them. He again went through what he termed her mobility to explain that she has no hip damage or anything like that. He was able to locate the points of pain immediately, applied pressure to them while engaging in what seems to be a form of massage and he then used ultrasound and heat.

He also gave her some simple exercises that happen to be the same he gave me.

Today she not only wanted to accompny me for my semiannual visit to the cardiologist (he says I'm doing well) but she also did some grocery shopping, with which I was able to help, and we had lunch before returning home. We are going out for our usual Friday fish (baked) dinner.

She has two treatments scheduled for next week, as I also do.

Joe and others, 8/5

Because my younger sister, her husband and grandson were here Sunday no need to send this to my older sister. It remains largely true about Lil but I am beginning to wonder if the treatments are not good for my circulatory disorders. Today's in particular, for swollen ankle. I awakened Friday ~~Saturday~~ night with sever pains in the more damaged foot and leg, more swelling, and since have been unable to use the leg without the knee rising higher than I intend and without the foot making a slapping noise. I've just returned from mailing a letter to the Johns Hopkins hematologist about it and on the family doctor's return tomorrow have an appointment to see him. He is not an expert.

Aside from what you said about our long friendship that we both cherish you said about Israel's situation what I'd intended to address at greater length. I do remember enough F French to understand that you said the more things change, the more they remain the same.

Aside from what I'll refer to briefly, as I was walking this morning I gave the matter some thought and now can see that perhaps something unexpected may evolve, something you'll remember I have long believed is necessary.

Charles Krauthammer has an oped piece in Saturday's Post severely critical of what Bush and Baker are up to:"What is the compelling the enormous expenditure of American diplomatic capital to create a conference that is headed for deadlock?" And more, particularly about Assad and Syria and getting in that bed. In the same paper, same place, Stephen Rosenfeld also goes after Bush for having "his priotities upside down" and specifying the domestic

situation. So I see for the first time media criticism from those who in general have supported Bush and his policies.

I realize that any PLO who speaks can be disowned by Arafat and that he did disown the very man who just said they'd go to the conference, in effect. I think they have to and that Shamir will make no further concessions. If they do not they are entirely lost and if they do and the conference proceeds there will before long be a forum for Israel's presentation of its case, relating to the PLO's history of civilian terrorism, which is not peace; to the mounting of terrorist attacks from Arab lands; to the destruction wrought from the Golan heights, to the preservation of a state of war by all Muslim governments except Egypt, and to Israel's historical rights to the "occupied" territories. Of the latter there is no real question. The Arabs were in it because they took it from the Jews who come from there.

Shamir has been publicly firm on not surrendering terrtory for "peace" or any other reason, and as I noted earlier, Assad went out of his way to demand 100% return as his inflexible precondition. Meaning there is no purpose in any conference for Israel. So it is clear in advance that absent some concession that cannot be expected, the conference will go nowhere and it will then be pretty apparent that knowing this, for his own reasons Bush persisted in forcing a conference.

Assad's interview can be interpreted as meaning he wants Arabs to have present Israel, too, the unchanged PLO charter. The Israeli ambassador on the MacNeil-Lehrer Report last Thursday said what was not to my knowledge picked up anywhere: Arafat had said on TV that he and the PLO have <u>not</u> recognized the State of Israel. So, it can be anticipated that Bush will need some kind of face-saver because US policy is based on the fiction that Arafat had said he and they did recognized the right of the State to exist. As I noted then and in a number of letters since then, he avoided saying what the administration said he said. Yet that was the basis for any US talking to the PLO.

Meanwhile, in all the talk about those UN resolutions, something essential is always omitted, assuring Israel of "secure" borders. Thus the question does become, how is who going to make those borders secure. Especially with the existing state of war and with Arafat after having disavowed any terrorism, refusing to condemn it by his own faction when they were caught at it.

If the Arabs agree, meaning the PLO and the other states, and there is a conference, it will, I am confident, get much attention and that for the first time Israel's side may get the denied attention. It is not, as I see it, impossible for there to emerge a situation in which Israel will be David against Goliath of Bush and his new Arab cronies.

Meanwhile some of the PLO have announced that they'll assassinate any Palestinians who go to the conference. Secure borders? And the BCCI banking scandals disclosed that Abu Nidal had a half <u>billion</u> dollars in it alone. Fron those who now say they want a meaningful peace, esp. the Saudis. And he is only one terrorist leader. Yet the Saudis have not yet repaid the US what it promsied to pay for being saved from Saddam. It can get interesting! Best,

Harry

8/6-for Dave in particular

Today's Post has a long article you'll find enclosed headed, "Israel Is Loosing Its Hold on Gaza," a fair encapsulation of what is by and large a reasonably fair story. However, it also omits much while getting to the edge of it.

This story was of particular interest to me because I have believed for about 20 years that if Israel is forced to make some territorial concession it should get Gaza off its back.

What this story does not include is that the deplorable conditions in Gaza were created deliberately by the Egyptians in particular. They herded all the Palestinians they could into those narrow confines and refused to let almost any of them leave. It was even difficult where not impossible for them to enter Egypt. And did nothing at all to be of any help. No such things as houses or sewers.

I believe it is Paul Johnson in his final chapter, "Zion," in his "A History of the Jews" who cites an Egyptian source as saying that Egypt intended using these wretched Palestinians and their wretched conditions as Arab "artillery" against Israel.

The story does make casual reference to some Israel efforts to improve their plight. Deep in debt as Israel was and in urgent need of housing for Israelis. What it does not say is, I believe, also in Johnson, that at the UN the Arabs combined to block every effort Israel made to improve the lot of the people in Gaza, meaning what required UN approval.

The Arabs were correct in regarding Gaza's refugees as their artillery. But the human cost that is never attributed to their Arab brothers that these people have paid and regardless of what happens will continue to pay is so awful!

It is its own kind of indictment of the Arab powers.

And if Gaza is ever on its own its plight will be even worse than it now is because it has gotten assistance from Israel and until the intifafa most of those who had work had it in Israel. I doubt the wealthy Arab states will want to put up any money to help them, as by establishing industries there. As time passes their conditions, which they worsened by their intifada, will deteriorate even more.

Considering what most of those Arab governments have done and do to their own people perhaps this is not as unusual as its seems to us. But it is terrible and it does defame all the decent Arabs who can do nothing about their own governments or for Gaza.

No matter what, it will always be ready to explode.

If for them there is any future, it is distant.

Best,

Harold